UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,481	03/15/2001	P. Read Montague	P01963US1	6279

26271	7590	08/05/2004

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP
1301 MCKINNEY
SUITE 5100
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095

EXAMINER
BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 March 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on March 15, 2001.

The Power of Attorney was received on June 8, 2001 and June 20, 2001.

The Declaration was received on June 12, 2001.

The Drawings were received on 3, 2001.

Claims 1 – 26 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16, 22-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Anupam (5862330).

Regarding claim 1, Anupam discloses a method implemented via a client-server

system for allowing a first client station to cause a second client station to display a

predetermined resource page (Column 1, lines 45 – 46), said method comprising the

steps of: providing access to a client-server system including a first client station, a

second client station (Column 1, lines 45 – 46), and a server station (Column 1, lines 59

– 61), the stations being disposed in electronic communication (Column 1, lines 60 –

61); providing a browser program for displaying resource pages on the second client

station (Column 1, lines 45 – 52), at the first station, transmitting an address for the

resource page to the second client station, at the second client station, receiving the

address of the resource page from the server station; and at the client station, operating

the browser program to download the resource page (Column 1, lines 62 – 67).

Regarding claim 2, Anupam discloses the step of providing access to a client-

server system includes providing access to the Internet (Column 2, lines 19 – 21).

Regarding claim 3, Anupam discloses the resource page is a web page, and

wherein the transmitting step includes transmitting the URL of the predetermined web

page (Column 2, lines 31 – 33).

Regarding claim 4, Anupam discloses the step of providing access to a client-

server station includes providing a server station configured to mediate communication

between the first client station and one or more passenger stations, including the

second client station (Column 1, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claim 5, Anupan discloses the transmitting step includes sending the

resource address from the first client station to the server station and, then, operating

the server station to broadcast the resource address to the second client station

(Column 1, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claim 6, Anupam discloses the step of receiving the resource address

from the server, includes sending the address to the browser program on the second

client station, and operating the browser program to download content (Column 2, lines

30 – 33).

Regarding claim 7, Anupam discloses the step of generating a browser window on the second client station, whereby the browser window communicates with the server station though a communication applet (Column 3, lines 3 – 9).

Regarding claim 8, Anupam discloses the steps of: providing a communication applet on the second client station; and operating the communication applet on the second client station to transmit information from the server station (Column 3, lines 3 – 9).

Regarding claim 9, Anupam discloses the step of operating the communication applet to communicate data between the first and second client station (Column 1, lines 55 – 67; Column 2, lines 33 – 34).

Regarding claim 10, Anupam discloses the step of operating the communication applet to receive data input from a user (Column 3, lines 20 – 24).

Regarding claim 11, Anupam discloses an interactive computer system for allowing a first computer to cause one or more second computers to display a predetermined web page, said system comprising (Column 1, lines 45 – 46): at least one first computer connected to computer network; one or more second computers connected to the computer network; and a server computer connected to the computer network, the server computer having a computer program storage device (Column 1, lines 45 – 67) and a program residing thereon, the program including instructions executable by the server computer for performing a method of transmitting a pre-selected URL resource address from the first computer to the second computer, the resource address identifying a predetermined web page to one or more of the second

computers for access thereon and such that the predetermined web page may be displayed by each of the second computers (Column 1, lines 62 – 67).

Regarding claim 12, Anupam discloses that the second computer includes a browser program for downloading files received from the server computer (Column 1, lines 44 – 52).

Regarding claim 13, Anupam discloses programming means for linking the one or more second computers with one or more second computers, such that a first computer controls, at least partially, the browser program on the one or more second computers (Column 1, lines 63 – 67).

Regarding claim 14, Anupam discloses programming means for predefining a set of websites and a connection scheme among the websites (Column 4, lines 6 – 17), the programming means being operable by a user of a first computer to control, at least partially, browser navigation on the one or more second computers (Column 1, lines 63 – 67).

Regarding claim 15, Anupam discloses programming means for defining a set of website URLs, such that the second computers may be guided through one or more of the websites defined by the set of URLs (Column 4, lines 4 – 26).

Regarding claim 16, Anupam discloses a method of annotating a web page via an interactive computer network (Column 2, lines 19 – 29), said method comprising the steps of: providing access to an interactive computer network including a first computer a server, and one or more second computers (Column 1, lines 55 – 67); providing a first annotation program operable with a first web browser residing on the first computer

(Column 2, lines 39 – 45; Column 3, lines 3 – 16); providing a second annotation

program operable with a second web browser residing on one of the second computers

(Column 3, lines 3 – 16), operating the first annotation program to annotate the web

content residing on the first computer (Column 1, lines 63 – 67); at the server, receiving

input from the first annotation program representative of the annotation provided on the

web content; operating the server to interact with the second annotation program so as

to annotate the web content residing on the second computer such that the annotation

provided thereon corresponds to the annotation provided on the first computer (Column

1, lines 63 – 67).

Regarding claim 22, Anupam discloses a method for linking at least one pilot

client station with a plurality of passenger client stations and guiding each of the

passenger stations through a plurality of web sites (Column 1, lines 45 – 46), the

method comprising the steps of: providing access to a network in communication with

the Internet and including a pilot client station, one or more passenger client stations,

and at least one server station disposed in communication with each of the pilot and

passenger stations (Column 1, lines 44 – 67); providing a server program on the server

station operable to facilitate communication between the pilot station and the passenger

stations (Column 1, lines 64 – 67); providing a browser program on each of the pilot and

passenger stations, the browser programs on the passenger stations being operable to

download web content upon receipt of a URL (Column 1, lines 44 – 52; Column 2, lines

29 – 33); operating the pilot station to define a set of website URLs (Column 4, lines 6 –

17); transmitting the set of predefined URLs to each of the passenger stations; and

guiding each of the passenger stations through one or more of the websites defined by

the set of URL's (Column 4, lines 6 – 17), the guiding step including operating the

browser program on each of the passenger stations to download the content of a web

page using the URL transmitted thereto (Column 5, lines 36 – 47).

Regarding claim 23, Anupam discloses that the transmitting step includes

transmitting the URLs via the server station (Column 1, lines 63 – 66).

Regarding claim 26, Anupam discloses the guiding step includes operating the

browser program on each of the passenger stations to download web content directly

without passing content through the server station (Column 5, lines 36 – 47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-18, 21, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Anupam (5862330) in view of Anupam (6411989).

Regarding claim 17, Anupam ('330) does not explicity indicate the step of

operating the first computer to move a mark placed on the web content thereon, to a

different location on the web content thereon, such that the corresponding mark

appearing on the second computer moves to a second location on each of the web

content displayed thereon, wherein the second location on the second computer

corresponds to the second location on the web content of the first computer. Anupam

('989) teaches the idea of accepting changes users browsers perform on the web

content being viewed interactively with other users (Column 2, lines 17 – 24). This

detection proprocates the detected change to the other users involved in the realtime

cooperative session (Column 7, lines 13 – 17). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Anupam's ('330)

disclosure with Anupam's ('989) teaching in order to allow the session to show full

interaction of one user and a webpage, such as important details in filling out web page

forms (Column 6, line 41 – Column 7, line 13)

Regarding claim 18, In the combination of Anupam's ('330) and ('989) references

discloses the step of operating the first computer to mark over a discrete location on the

arbitrary web content appearing thereon, such that a corresponding mark is made over

a corresponding location on the web content appearing on the second client station

(Column 6, lines 18 – 36; Column 6, line 41 – Column 7, line 13).

Regarding claim 24, Anupam ('330) discloses the guiding step includes guiding

each of the passenger stations to a website (Column 1, lines 63 – 67), but does not

explicitly indicate preventing the passenger stations from accessing a website other

than one common website designated by operation of the pilot station. Anupam ('989)

teaches the idea of having one of the users at a given point in time have control over

the interactive session, preventing other users from moving to a new address (Column

7, lines 13 – 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use Anupam ('989) teaching in Anupam's ('330) system

to create organization and access control over the viewing process (Column 7, lines 13 – 25).

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Anupam ('330) and ('989) from the rejection to claim 24 discloses the guiding step further includes the step of defining a subset gated community comprising a predefined collection of URLs, and wherein the guiding step further includes the step of guiding each of the passenger stations into the gated community, whereby each of the passenger stations can freely move between one or more of the collection of predefined URLs ('330, Column 4, lines 8 – 11).

Regarding claim 21, the combination of Anupam ('330) and ('989) from the rejection to claim 24 discloses the steps of operating the first client station as a pilot station and restricting navigation of the World Wide Web on each of the second client stations (Column 7, lines 13 – 25).

Claims 19 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam (5862330) in view of Pacifici (6230171).

Regarding claim 19, Anupam does not explicity indicate the step of synchronizing pointers on each of the second computers to correspond to a location of a pointer on the first computer. Pacifici discloses showing a pointer on all collaborating users and that the pointer needs to be in an identical position for all users (Column 1, lines 24 – 28; Column 3, lines 28 – 31; Column 5, lines 58 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Pacifici's teachings of synchronizing a pointer on all collaborating computer in Anupam's system

in order to use the pointer to help the interaction by pointing to draw the users attention

to key locations (Column 5, lines 58 – 67).

Regarding claim 20, Anupam does not explicity indicate that the steps of sizing a

window for displaying web content on each of the second computers such that the

window corresponds to the size of a corresponding window for the web content

appearing on the first computer. Pacifici discloses a synchronization of web content into

the form sizing the browsers to equal positions (Column 3, lines 29 – 34). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

force window sizes of collaborating systems to be the same so that the mark up and

pointer positions are identical, thus effective (Column 3, lines 1 – 9).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6108687 issued to Craig, because it discloses a pilot user

directing a series of users through a list of predetermined websites, listed by the pilot

and restricted to these websites.

U. S. Patent No. 5784058 issued to LaStrange, because it discloses a first

computer that can control the browser display of a second user across a network.

U. S. Patent No. 5649105 issued to Aldred, because it discloses a collaborative

working environment between two users involving a network and their screen displays.

U. S. Patent No. 5941957 issued to Ingrassia, because it discloses a controller that allows users to cooperatively browse websites. It involves sending applets to create interface channels.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (703) 605-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
July 29, 2004

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER